

REMARKS

It is noted that the status of claim 57 was not indicated on the "Office Action Summary." However, it is believed that claim 57 is currently pending. Clarification is respectfully requested if this is incorrect.

Claim 61 has been cancelled with prejudice or disclaimer, while claims 62 and 63 have been written in independent form. No new matter has been added.

Claims 33-35, 38-44, 47-50, 56-58, 62, 63, 70, and 72-77 are now pending for examination. Claims 33-35, 38-44, 47-50, 56, 58, 70, and 72-77 have been indicated as being allowable.

Substitute Specification

Regarding the substitute specification filed on August 6, 2009, it appears that the Patent Office inadvertently combined the Substitute Specification with the translation of WO 95/15147 filed as part of the Information Disclosure Statement also filed on that day. In the "Specification" shown on PAIR, pages 1-10 appear to be the Substitute Specification as filed. Pages 11-30 of the "Specification" and the two pages identified as "Claims" appear to be from the translation of WO 95/15147, not from the Substitute Specification. This translation, of course, forms no part of the specification. If the Examiner has any further questions with respect to which parts of the enclosed papers define the Substitute Specification, and which parts of the enclosed papers should be properly categorized as IDS documents, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. In addition, it is also respectfully requested that the Examiner review and consider the translation of WO 95/15147 discussed above, if he has not done so already.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Mentrup

Claim 61 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Mentrup, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,498,420.

Claim 61 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn. However, the accuracy of this rejection is not conceded.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, any necessary extension of time is hereby requested. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. S1509.70029US00.

Dated: January 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Tani Chen, Sc.D.
Registration No.: 52,728
Patrick R.H. Waller, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 41,418
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000